



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,965	07/25/2002	Satoshi Omura	5012-1018	4910

466 7590 05/01/2003

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER
----------

PESELEV, ELLI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

7

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/088,965

Applicant(s)

OMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Elli Peselev

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-20 and 22-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8-10,15,16,24 and 35-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7,11-14,17-20,22,23 and 27-34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1623

Claims 1, 24-27, 32-35, 37-40, 44-47 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terminology "wherein R1 is Me or I-Pr, R2 is not H" renders claim 1 indefinite. Such terminology as "wherein when R1 is Me or I-Pr, R2 is not H" can be used to overcome the rejection.

The terminology "substituents" (claims 1 and 27) renders the claims indefinite since it is not clear what specific moieties are encompassed by said terminology. Note that the specification fails to provide definition of the term "substituent".

The terminology "heterocyclic containing N" renders claim 27 indefinite because it is not clear how many carbon atoms and how many hetero atoms are contained in the heterocyclic and what other hetero atoms, besides nitrogen are contained in the heterocyclic/

The terms "novel" (claims 1, 27, 35, 40 and 47) and "general (claims 1, 24-27, 32-35, 37-40, 44-47 and 50-52) are superfluous.

Claims 1 and 24-26 are substantial duplicates. Note that the compounds of claims 24-26 encompass nothing more than the compounds of claim 1.

Claims 27 and 32-34 are substantial duplicates.

Claims 35 and 37-39 are substantial duplicates.

Claims 40 and 44-46 are substantial duplicates.

Claims 47 and 50-52 are substantial duplicates.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 8-10, 15-16, 24-26 and 35-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hoeltje et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,224), Kirst et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,106,961), or Gidda et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,920,102).

Hoeltje et al disclose the claimed compounds wherein one of R1 or R2 is Me or H and the other is isopropyl.

Each of Kirst et al and Gidda et al discloses the claimed compounds wherein each of R1 and R2 is methyl.

The claimed compounds are anticipated by Hoetje et al, Kirst et al or Gidda et al.

In addition, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made would have been motivated to use a next higher homologue of methyl in the references' compounds because such a person would have expected the resulting compounds to possess the same utility.

Claims 3-7, 11-14, 17-20, 22-23 and 27-34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is 703-308-4616. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8.30 a.m. - 5.00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 703-308-4624. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

*elli peselev*  
**ELLI PESELEV**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 1800**